

Foreign Service officers of class 5

Ware Adams	Charles H. Heisler
Burton Y. Berry	Hervé J. L'Heureux
Lee R. Blohm	John H. Madonna
James C. H. Bonbright	Erik W. Magnuson
Daniel M. Braddock	Horatio Mooers
James E. Brown, Jr.	James K. Penfield
Homer M. Byington, Jr.	Edwin Schoenrich
Everett F. Drumright	Horace H. Smith
Elbridge Durbrow	Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr.
Peter H. A. Flood	Edward T. Wailes
Richard B. Haven	Carlos J. Warner
	Thomas C. Wasson

Foreign Service officers of class 8

Theodore C. Achilles	Edward Page, Jr.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr.	George W. Renchard
Roy E. B. Bower	Henry E. Stebbins
Montgomery H. Coladay	Francis Bowden Stevens
John Davies, Jr.	Laurence W. Taylor
William S. Farrell	Robert F. Woodward
Heyward G. Hill	James H. Wright
J. Winsor Ives	Lloyd D. Yates
Robert G. McGregor, Jr.	

Foreign Service officers of class 7

Hector C. Adam, Jr.	Donal F. McGonigal
William K. Allshie	J. Graham Parsons
E. Tomlin Bailey	Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.
Russell W. Benton	John C. Pool
Roswell C. Beverstock	George F. Scherer
Glen W. Bruner	William P. Snow
Richard W. Byrd	Carl W. Strom
Gilbon Curtis, Jr.	Earle C. Taylor
Andrew B. Foster	T. Elliot Well
Owen W. Gaines	Ivan B. White
Norris S. Hasetton	Arthur R. Williams
Douglas MacArthur 2d	Elbert G. Mathews

Foreign Service officers of class 8

William Belton	Robert Grinnell
Lampton Berry	Theodore J. Hadraba
William O. Boswell	Robert F. Hale
Charles R. Burrows	Parker T. Hart
Robert T. Cowan	Franklin Hawley
Leon L. Cowles	Martin J. Hillenbrand
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr.	John Everts Horner
Philip M. Davenport	Outerbridge Horsey
Richard H. Davis	Hungerford B. Howard
Arthur B. Emmons 3d	William L. Krieg
Vernon L. Fluharty	Carl F. Norden
Fulton Freeman	R. Kenneth Oakley
A. David Fritzman	Robert W. Rinden
Ralph C. Getsinger	George Lybrook West, Jr.
John Goodyear	Randolph A. Kidder

IN THE NAVY**JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL**

Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY*Rear admiral*

Roscoe E. Schuirmann to be rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service to rank from May 16, 1942

To be commodores in the Navy, for temporary service

Edward J. Moran	Edward J. Foy
Henry S. Kendall	Frederick G. Reinicke
Giles E. Short	William A. Sullivan
Leslie E. Gehres	Andrew F. Carter
Thomas S. Combs	

IN THE MARINE CORPS**TEMPORARY SERVICE**

Brig. Gen. William H. Rupertus to be major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 28, 1942.

Col. Lemuel C. Shepherd to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 16, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord of life, like the wise one of old, we pray for wisdom that we may not go astray in the wilderness of selfish ambitions. Out of the gates of Thy throne flow the streams that sweeten the bitter waters of human experience; help us to acquire pure hearts and contented minds. When weariness of heart threatens, strengthen us; when petty vexations distract, refresh us with the benediction of Thy grace.

Almighty God, we would repeat it over and over again that it is the unseen life which is real and eternal, that which is seen is temporal. O consider our hopes, our yearning spirits, our unspoken prayers and our quivering faith which so often in silence and loneliness look up to Thee, too sacred for speech. Be not blind to the virtues and graces which live in many a human breast, not set on selfish ends. As Thou dost look down upon the martyrdom of man, bearing the whips and scorns in pain and in sorrow, O let the burning truth steady all souls that brutal force and power cannot survive. They that mourn are blessed and Thy comfort and triumph are reserved for them; the peacemakers shall yet see the children of God destined to inherit the earth. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Second Congressional District of Kansas, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Representative-elect ERRETT P. SCRIVNER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

LIVING COSTS IN ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. PROESER and Mr. MILLER], who, like myself, represent part of the city of St. Louis, I present to the House for reference to the proper committee petitions signed by the citizens of our city, containing 54,607 names, urging a reduction in the cost of living.

These petitions are addressed to the Congress of the United States asking for a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures:

First. Subsidies on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers.

Second. Grade labeling.

Third. Dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level.

Fourth. Continued rent control.

Fifth. A strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control, given adequate funds for enforcement, with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors.

An organization which is known as the United Labor Committee of Greater St. Louis, representing the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the railroad brotherhoods, and other unions in cooperating with other citizens and organizations, circulated the petitions and secured the signatures. By no means are all the signers of the petitions members of labor organizations. Thousands of the signers are housewives. Volunteer workers set up booths in the neighborhood shopping areas calling those who passed to the attention of the petitions, the purpose of preparing them, and urging signatures provided the citizen was in favor of the effort. It fairly represents the opinion of the citizens of St. Louis, especially those whose earnings place them in what we commonly call the lower brackets.

It is admitted that there has been some increase in wages but for a long time few increases have been made while the cost of living has steadily increased. I am not talking now about luxuries but the necessities of life—food, clothing, medicine, and so forth. I feel confident if the cost of living could be put back to September 15, 1942, there would be practically no demands for increase in wages, but when the wage earner finds that his weekly earnings are not sufficient to properly care for his family, naturally there is dissension. We do not want black markets nor do we want the people of this country bidding for such commodities as are available.

I have never been enthusiastic about subsidies, but if subsidies are necessary in order to maintain the standard of living to which our citizens are accustomed, then serious consideration should be given to the efforts of those administering the various laws who advocate subsidies.

The Office of Price Administration has been giving attention to a program for rolling the cost of living back nearly 5 percent, or to that which prevailed Sep-

tember 15, 1942. Recently the general manager of the Office of Price Administration announced a three-way program. It is to be hoped that those administering the laws can grant the relief desired by these petitions, but in the event that they cannot, then I urge that Congress give serious consideration to the entire question.

The officers of the United Labor Committee that forwarded these petitions are Joseph P. Clark, president; William Sentner, first vice president; William Anderson, treasurer; Oscar A. Ehrhardt, secretary.

Executive board: Victor Boggs, Richard Brazier, John J. Church, Ben Gilbert, Lloyd McBride, Harry Mertz, James Pfaffenbach, Louis Renschen, John I. Rollings, Lloyd Weber.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, these petitions which have been prepared by the United Labor Committee of St. Louis, constitute an expression of many thousands of St. Louisans who are alarmed by the failure of O. P. A. to control the increases in the cost of living. The objective of these petitions is to hold prices down, to prevent any further inflationary price rises. That is a worthy and most necessary objective.

We all do not agree on the practical steps which may be used to correct a situation which has already been allowed to get out of bounds. I do not agree that all of the steps advocated in these petitions are either sound economically or workable, but I think we can all agree that the Price Control Act, as amended by the Congress in 1942, did give sufficient power to the Office of Price Administration to accomplish worthwhile results. It is regrettable that administration of that law has been such as to cause failure in many price fields.

Congress should continue diligent efforts toward the objective expressed in these petitions.

REDUCING THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. PLOESER], in presenting to the House for reference to the appropriate committee the petitions bearing the signatures of 54,607 citizens of St. Louis urging the Congress to aid in reducing the cost of living.

The United Labor Committee of Greater St. Louis, comprising representatives of the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods, have rendered a splendid public service in circulating and securing the signatures to these petitions. In this effort they have succeeded in bringing more forcibly to the attention of the citizens of St. Louis the grave situation not only confronting them but the people of the Nation in the matter of the cost of living.

The rising spiral of prices, with the attendant threat of inflation, has been felt in every home. The time has come,

not only to put an end if possible to any further rise in the prices of the necessities of life, but especially foods, but to turn these prices back to the levels of September 15, 1942.

Congress has increased the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by \$350,000,000 in an effort to hold the line and turn back the prices of certain foodstuffs. In my judgment it would have been best had the price on all necessities been frozen the day war was declared—this the Congress was not asked to do—and those in charge of our Government at Washington failed to do.

I cannot conscientiously subscribe to the belief that subsidies are the proper means to stabilize and roll back prices. If I thought this would do the job, I would back such a proposal to the limit. On the contrary, subsidies will only aggravate what is already a bad situation, due to the bungling and incompetence of the policies and personnel of the O. P. A. Everyone is agreed that prices must be kept down and where out of line turned back to reasonable levels. Subsidies will not prevent inflation—they will contribute to it by giving more people more money with which to bid in the black market for the things that they want and need. A hungry man with hungry children at home will not debate the price of meat or bread, nor where or how, or how much he will pay for it. He will demand and obtain these things at the risk of his own life.

We must remember that the consumer is also a taxpayer who has an added interest in food subsidies. He and his descendants must repay not only the principal but the interest and administration cost of subsidies. And what does this mean in terms of dollars and cents? It is estimated upon good authority that a total subsidy program upon foods would cost no less than \$450,000,000, with an additional \$50,000,000 for administration—making a total of \$500,000,000. To pay this subsidy the Government must sell bonds maturing in, say, 50 years, bearing interest at the rate of 2.9 percent. The interest on these bonds alone would amount to \$725,000,000, and this added to the subsidy of \$500,000,000 would mean that it would cost the taxpayers a minimum of \$1,225,000,000, which, in simpler terms, means that each individual who saves \$3.92 on his 1943 grocery bill would be obliged to pay back in interest and cost of administration \$9.15.

What right have we to saddle upon the returned soldier, who now receives \$50 per month and risks his life for us, an unpaid portion of today's grocery bill while some of those at home earn \$400 and \$500 per month? It is as my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Congressman MUNDT, observed, like putting a tax on the chauffeur's beer to help buy champagne for the owner of the automobile. Shall today's food be paid in cash by me or partly in I O U's tomorrow by the soldier who is fighting to make my job and our form of government secure?

Our present problem is one not so much of price as it is of production. It is one of scarcity and not of surplus.

The demands of the armed forces and those of our allies have created a scarcity of those commodities which are essential to our existence, and which we have become accustomed to believe were always abundant.

The answer to this important question does not lie in sugar-coated subsidies but in production and more production of the very things that we seek to subsidize. The days of planned scarcities as advocated and practiced by the New Deal are at an end. The answer now and hereafter should be to develop and practice a philosophy of plenty.

It would not be proper to condemn subsidies and expose the fallacies of such a program without being able to offer a plan to solve the difficulties of the present situation. It is my firm belief that we need a program which will encourage rather than discourage maximum production of food and fair distribution at equitable prices. I propose: First, effective coordination through a single head of our Government activities affecting food production, distribution, and price control. Second, a manpower program for the farmers which will enable them to produce the maximum of foodstuffs and feed. Third, provision for adequate supplies of farm machinery and the necessary fuel for carrying out such a program. Fourth, simplification of the operation of price controls with greater utilization of the experience of those engaged in producing and marketing food and farm products.

It seems to me that adequate provision has been made to enable O. P. A. to effectively test its control over the price of certain foodstuffs during the coming year. Should O. P. A. continue to bungle, and should the program of price controls flounder and fall in a maze of mistakes, then it is imperative that we proceed at once to remove the cause of the present deplorable condition; that is, lack of production of essential foodstuffs.

I am delighted to unite my efforts with those of my colleagues from Missouri in bringing these petitions to the attention of the Congress with the fervent hope and sincere prayer that a solution may be found of the difficulties which they depict. The Congress is truly the voice of the people and to it should they always be able to come and find redress.

THE MILK SITUATION IN NORTHERN OHIO

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter this morning from one of my constituents, and I think it might be well to read it to the House. That letter is as follows:

Mr. Rowe: If the Government wishes to help the dairymen of northern Ohio, something should be done quickly. I realize that you belong to the minority party and cannot get much attention from the O. P. A.

Yours,

KARL H. SWAN.

P. S.—You need not take your valuable time to acknowledge this squawk.

Enclosed with the letter is the following advertisement:

NOTICE!

With much regret, on Saturday, September 11, we will discontinue our retail delivery of milk.

Due to O. P. A. ceiling on milk prices, scarcity of feed, and labor conditions, it becomes necessary we make this decision.

We wish to thank all our customers for their patronage and hope that some day we will be back to serve you again.

Sincerely,

HARLAN DALE FARMS.

At a later date, 103 head of registered Holsteins and Jersey cattle will be offered for private sale.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of shipbuilding and merchant seamen, and include a statement by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land; also a release from the War Shipping Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by my colleague [Mr. PLOESER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a proclamation by the President designating the week of October 3 as Fire Prevention Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, flood damage on the Missouri River can be ended for all time. I do not say that as my own opinion; I say it as the result of reading a report approved by the United States Army engineers. Last Saturday afternoon I went to the office of the Chief of Engineers and read the report of the division engineer made in response to a resolution by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives. The report was prepared by Col. Lewis A. Pick, who has just left the division for an overseas assignment. It has been approved by the Board of Engineers and is now under review by the Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The report is not released, as yet, and of course, will not be until transmitted to the Congress, but Members can read it and can draw conclusions or make observations on it as I am now doing. For the benefit of those who have not yet had an opportunity to read it, let me say this:

The report and recommendations follow the analysis of Missouri River flood problems made by Colonel Pick in the series of addresses he gave at meetings arranged this summer by Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, chairman of the Eight-State Committee. Downstream below Sioux City, where the flood plain is wide, the report calls for levees on the main stem of the river and dams on the tributaries. Above Sioux City, where the bluffs are closer together and reservoir sites abound, the report recommends multiple-purpose storage reservoirs in sufficient number to impound and put under control the entire flow of the river for the largest flood on record.

The cost of this program is less than 10 times the popular estimate of direct and indirect damages of last year's floods. In other words, 10 floods like those of 1943 would cost as much as what both the division engineer and the Board of Engineers describe as complete protection for the flood plain below Sioux City for all floods of past magnitude.

I trust that all Members interested will do what they can to expedite transmission of the report to Congress and action on it here.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include in one a resolution passed by the Oil Workers' Convention and in the other an editorial from the Pacific Rural Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's business and any other special orders that may be on the calendar, I may be granted permission to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CLARA CITY, MINN., LEADS NATION IN WAR BOND DRIVE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Clara City, Minn., is a village containing only 844 people. Today it stands out as the No. 1 community in the Nation in the Third War Loan drive. This

small village with a loan goal of \$43,000 went over the top even before the drive was officially opened.

In recognition of Clara City's accomplishment a captured Japanese submarine was rerouted in its tour of Minnesota, and as a consequence over \$14,000 additional in bonds were sold in a 3-hour period in this patriotic community.

The following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of September 19, 1943, illustrates what a small village can do in a war loan drive, and I personally am proud of having in my congressional district, the seventh of Minnesota, the Nation's No. 1 leader in this respect:

DOUBLE QUOTA LOOMS AS SALES BOOM

(By Willmar Thorkelson)

CLARA CITY, MINN.—Salute the No. 1 community on the Nation's bondwagon.

It's this alert Minnesota village of 844 persons.

Beating to the punch the rest of the State and Nation, Clara City hustled to its Third War Loan goal of \$43,000 even before the drive officially opened.

And today this town's citizens had good reason to believe they would double their own quota for cash-in-the-bank War bond sales at close of business Saturday totaled \$74,384.73.

This is 173 percent of their quota.

Going over the top ahead of the Third War Loan's start is a tribute to the energy and organization of local War bond officials, who decided as long ago as last April this village would be first in this drive.

The feat was accomplished, too, because almost 100 percent of the families bought bonds.

These people, more than 80 percent of them of German descent, attained their goal largely in small denomination E series bonds.

Only 16 of the bonds bought were \$1,000 or larger, and the biggest individual purchase was \$4,000, made by Dr. H. T. Foshager, the town's physician.

In recognition of Clara City's accomplishment, the captured Jap submarine was rerouted in its tour of Minnesota and was brought here Thursday. No other community so small has been visited by the sub.

Appearance here of the enemy vessel of destruction resulted in the sale of \$14,193.75 in bonds in 3 hours Thursday morning.

In addition, youngsters at the village's public and parochial schools bought \$112 in War stamps as their admission.

About 1,200 persons, including scores of farmers from this center's rich trade area, viewed the sub during its half-hour stay.

Yeoman Eddie Gallaher, of Navy Public Relations, Minneapolis, traveling with the sub in Minnesota, congratulated Clara City on behalf of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau.

The village's 68-year-old mayor, John Barney, Sr., who came from Germany 50 years ago, reminded the audience how fortunate they were to be "living in the good old U. S. A."

He urged his citizens to buy even more War bonds, "so when the war is over and our boys come back, we can look into their eyes, shake their hands, tell them they won the war for us and that we at home tried our best to help them win it."

Backing up the 134 men in service from Clara City and vicinity was one of the indirect objectives of the campaign.

Fred Frekker, State highway employee and a regular bond buyer, said he didn't know a better way to support his only three sons, Donald, Willard, and Leslie, all in the service, than by buying bonds. "I don't know of a better investment, either," he declared.

Village War-bond chairman is E. G. Weflen, manager of Farmers Cooperative Elevator Association, who is a World War veteran and has a son, Arnold, who is a marine lieutenant.

Weflen credits success of the drive to the splendid cooperation solicitors received from the village's citizens and to the excellent help of the town's two banks and Postmaster Laurence Voight.

Dr. R. A. Merrill, veterinarian and member of the Chippewa County war finance committee, insists Clara City made its record because it is "the garden spot of western Minnesota and can produce the 'kale' needed to buy War bonds. Besides, this community is noted for its frugality."

Emil A. Swanson, editor of the Clara City Herald, suggests the reason is that the town is "the home of good organization," which happens to be its motto.

During the Second War Loan drive last April, the village had a goal of \$23,000, which it exceeded the first day. It ended that campaign with \$41,995 in sales.

That response encouraged Weflen and Gordon A. Yock, merchant and area war-bond chairman, to try to reach Clara City's September quota even before the drive started.

They wired early for pledge cards which were distributed at a solicitors' meeting September 1. The 29 solicitors each were assigned a list of prospects and by the evening of September 7 sufficient pledges had been redeemed in cash bond purchases to exceed the quota. This was 36 hours before the drive was launched in Minnesota.

In organizing the campaign, Weflen and Yock worked closely with W. D. Grashuis, president of Citizens State Bank of Clara City, and B. A. Behrends, cashier of Clara City State Bank.

Besides these four men, others responsible for Clara City's war-bond successes as solicitors included: John Andresen, William Andresen, Henry Koester, E. J. Thein, Peter DeGrote, John Caspers, F. P. Schulte, C. H. Stefens, Dr. R. A. Merrill, August Mohr, John Thein, Emil Swanson, J. B. Stager, Adrian Haen, George Tammen, Elso Davids, A. L. Thissen, W. E. Lynam, Dr. H. T. Poshager, Louis Tammen, A. E. Prekker, Sr., Mrs. Daniel Jaenisch, Charles Wulling, and George Thein.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has asked me to request that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAUK] be permitted to extend his own remarks under the title "Army and Navy Electronics Production Agency."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I recently received from the Danciger Oil Refining Company of Fort Worth, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON GASOLINE RATIONING AND OIL PRODUCTION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take the time of the House to announce that the Special Committee on Gasoline Rationing and Oil Production, of which I have the honor to be chairman, will meet tomorrow, Wednesday morning, in the caucus room in the Old House Office Building at 11 o'clock. Members of the executive committee from each State are especially urged to be present, and, of course, all other Members of the House, both from the Midwest and from the East, will be very welcome.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. Lecompte. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a set of resolutions of the Commercial Club of Albia, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

CONGRATULATIONS, LEO CROWLEY

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, recently the President announced two changes in his official family—the appointment of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and Leo T. Crowley to new positions of trust and responsibility. Both appointments have been received with generous and favorable comment by the Washington newspapers.

I do not know Mr. Stettinius but judging from his past record and the favorable comments made by those who do know him, it would indicate that the President made an excellent choice.

Mr. Crowley comes from my home city at Madison, Wis., and has been a personal friend since childhood. It is, therefore, with extreme gratification and pleasure that I read of Leo's elevation to increased responsibility and trust on the part of the President of the United States during its most trying period since the Civil War. Mr. Crowley's increased responsibilities are the result of the efficient and satisfactory manner in which he has discharged other duties entrusted to him by the President.

He came to Washington from Madison, Wis., as Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which office he has filled with exceptional skill and the least possible amount of friction. So well was the President satisfied with Mr. Crowley's conduct of this agency that he placed additional burdens upon him.

The next post of trust was the Office of Custodian of Alien Property. This Office meant the taking over of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property

and thousands of patent rights. It also meant that President Roosevelt did not want any of the scandals arising in the administration of these properties which grew out of the custodianship of alien property in the last World War. That Office has evidently been administered with the usual skill with which Mr. Crowley has administered the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Next came the difficult task of taking over the functions of the foreign economic activities that had been the subject of a controversy between Vice President WALLACE and Secretary of Commerce Jones. This was a difficult task to undertake because of prominence given by the newspapers in regard to this controversy, and the fact that newspapers and magazines were taking sides on the questions involved. In the face of these facts, Mr. Crowley presided with his usual unassuming tact and diplomacy to iron out the difficulties and get this office functioning in a proper manner. Undoubtedly a satisfactory result was achieved because the President would not have again entrusted him with additional burdens and responsibility unless he had been certain that a satisfactory job was being done by Mr. Crowley.

Now comes the latest burden and responsibility placed upon Mr. Crowley's shoulders—that of administering the billions of dollars passed out to the United Nations under lend lease and also the relief program originally placed in the hands of New York's former Governor Lehman.

To the thousands of friends of Leo Crowley back home, there is genuine pleasure in the honors heaped upon him, and there is every confidence that these offices of trust will be ably and efficiently administered, and there is one thing of which all of us will be absolutely certain: there will be no scandals growing out of any of these functions because Leo Crowley is scrupulously honest and will not tolerate the suspicion of dishonesty on the part of any of his subordinates.

Many who come to Washington and achieve high honors become afflicted with the disease known as "Washingtonitis." In the case of Leo Crowley, there is not the slightest change in his manner or attitude toward the thousands of people whom he has always known. On the streets of Madison, in the barber shops and wherever men gather, he is still just Leo to everyone. The thousands of his friends in all walks of life, including the old, the young, the rich and the poor, men, women, and children, all rejoice that he has been elevated to a high place, and all of them have every confidence that the trust reposed in him will be faithfully carried out.

Kind and generous to everyone, his sympathetic and gentle nature breeds affection and loyalty in the hearts of those with whom he is associated.

Congratulations, Leo; and the best of luck.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

GEN. JOHN L. DEWITT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks to include a resolution adopted by the San Francisco Down Town Association with reference to Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt and the distinguished service he has rendered both to the Pacific coast and the Nation in his administration of the Japanese question and all other military matters which have been under his jurisdiction as commander of the Fourth Army and western defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in all Pacific coast history there has never been a more capable military officer assigned to duty on the Pacific coast. He has won the support, good will, and hearty approval of every civic, labor, church, and fraternal organization by the superb manner in which he has handled every problem of military significance affecting our civilian population and national security. His very presence and demeanor have helped build civilian morale and gave a deep sense of security to every man, woman, and child during the days immediately following the cowardly Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. As a tribute to this outstanding man I present the following resolution recently adopted by the Down Town Association:

D'WITT COMMENDED FOR CONTROL OF JAPANESE

The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors of the Down Town Association today, Wednesday, September 15, 1943:

Whereas since the black-out nights and the anxious days following Pearl Harbor, Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt has rendered distinguished service as commander of the Fourth Army and western defense, and California has felt secure under the protection of his wise leadership and the policies he has adopted and enforced; and

Whereas that sense of security has rested in large part upon his understanding, courage, and vigor in promptly excluding all persons of the Japanese race, whether native or foreign-born, from the Pacific coast area; and

Whereas Gen. John L. DeWitt has been assigned to higher command at the Army and Navy Staff College at Washington, and Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons succeeds to the heavy responsibility of commander of the Fourth Army; and

Whereas the Down Town Association of San Francisco has heretofore gone on record and directed a communication to the Secretary of War opposing, in the interest of public security, the return of any persons of Japanese ancestry to the Pacific coast area during the war period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Down Town Association of San Francisco hereby expresses to General DeWitt its sincere appreciation and compliments for the outstanding service which he has rendered to his country and especially to California and the entire Pacific coast area, in the performance of his duties as commander of our armed forces charged with the protection of the exposed western borders of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That to his successor, Gen. Delos C. Emmons, we convey a welcome and the expression of our confidence that his past distinguished services can be accepted as an assurance that the security which we have felt under his predecessor will be continued under his command and that the wise policy

of excluding Japanese from the Pacific coast area will be maintained throughout the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LABOR LAWS—AND LOGIC

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial that appeared in the September 11, 1943, issue of Business Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks of today in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial which appeared in the September 11, 1943, issue of Business Week, published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., I would like to make this observation.

This publication, as everyone knows, speaks the mind of business. It appears from this editorial that since business has had a chance to see the results of the Connally-Smith Act, it realizes it was bad legislation.

When the Connally-Smith war labor disputes bill—the so-called antistrike bill—was before the Congress, we were informed by various means, and from numerous sources, that organized labor opposed the bill.

In view of the fact that business is now opposed to the Connally-Smith Act, as well as labor, and it is universally recognized it is a bad law, there should be no hesitancy on the part of Congress to correct this innocuous situation by repealing the Connally-Smith Act at once. I sincerely hope every Member of Congress will read every word of this editorial very carefully.

UNADJUSTED VETERANS' CLAIMS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain figures from the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that has been troubling me for some time and I am sure that it is also troubling the Members of the House, and that is the backlog of unadjudicated cases of World War No. 2 veterans pending in the Veterans' Administration offices. In Boston alone the unadjudicated cases are increasing at the rate of 600 a month approximately.

In the Boston office, on September 22, of this year, there were pending 4,300 cases unadjudicated of World War No. 2. On September 1, 3,900 cases were un-

adjudicated. It is an inexcusable situation. The officials should have thought of this problem in time to provide sufficient personnel and if they did not have them within their own department they should have asked for such personnel in departments where their work is not so necessary. The matter was brought to the Veterans' Administration's attention on numerous occasions, but no action was taken, although the Administration had all information needed from the War Department regarding cases.

The Veterans' Administration advises me they have asked to have additional rating boards and additional personnel to go to the district and regional offices. I am not at all convinced that they will send enough. Requests were made some time ago for personnel with no results. I know that every Member will join with me in seeing that that is done because the least we can do is to see that these returning men who are disabled receive proper care and the compensation to which they are entitled. The matter of hospitalization facilities is one that I have been working on. They are inadequate. Most of these cases are men who have been discharged from the service because of service disability. It is of little use to pass legislation for the veterans if the laws we pass are not put into action promptly and employed for the veteran's benefit. It is either highly inefficient on the part of the Veterans' Administration or worse.

The following resolutions have been received from the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans' Association:

Whereas by bitter experience, we learned that those veterans who served overseas and bore the brunt of battle were among the first to enter and among the last to be discharged from active service; and

Whereas we found most of the positions with real remuneration had been filled by those who avoided war service altogether or who had served a very short time in the armed forces in World War No. 1; and

Whereas history appears to be about to repeat itself;

We, therefore, the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans Association, A. E. F., in convention assembled in historic Boston, September 11, 1943, hereby duly resolve that we respectfully petition the President and the congressional delegation from Massachusetts individually, to work for and provide the necessary laws that the men who actually do the fighting and bear the real brunt of the present World War No. 2 shall be adequately protected and be given at least an equal opportunity for such positions as may be open at the close of the present conflict, to those who may be honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

And we do hereby further resolve that copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, to the congressional delegation from Massachusetts, to the Governor of Massachusetts, to the President of the Massachusetts Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts, and to Commissioner Rae Long, chairman of the commission to study employment problems for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Whereas it has been found to be increasingly more difficult to obtain hospitalization for veterans with service-connected disabili-

ities and practically impossible to obtain such hospitalization in United States Government hospitals for non-service-connected veterans of World War No. 1, and,

Whereas our National Government has by various laws provided that such hospitalization should be made available to such veterans,

We, therefore, the One Hundred and First Infantry Veterans Association, A. E. F., duly resolve in convention assembled in historic Boston on September 11, 1943, to respectfully petition our President and the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to work for and provide for such adequate hospitalization facilities at once.

And be it further resolved that we respectfully petition the Governor and the legislative bodies in Massachusetts to provide for the proper extension of present hospital facilities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts so that the present increasing need and the future hospitalization requirements of all war veterans may be fully arranged for in proper time, with courage and vision, based on past experience, to the end that the veterans of World War No. 2 will not be subjected to the overcrowding and to being cared for in places and under conditions not fit for human habitation as were numerous disabled veterans of World War No. 1.

Respectfully submitted by John W. Coughlin, K Co.

JOHN W. COUGHLIN,
South Boston, Mass.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of my distinguished friend and colleague from Missouri prompt me to make this statement.

I understand from Mr. Byrnes that the national income is now flowing at the rate of \$150,000,000,000 per annum. I also understand from the Department of Commerce that industrial wages and salaries will be paid for this calendar year to the tune of about \$101,000,000,000. It seems to me that if we continue to finance the war activities to the extent we are at the present time through commercial banks and continue to hesitate in enacting a tax law that will bring into the Treasury a much greater part of the funds that we are not now spending, that prices must continue to rise and bring greater disturbance and dissatisfaction among those people who are living on a fixed income and who are not participating in the flow of the war billions throughout the country. I personally believe that prices will continue to rise at a rather disastrous rate, and, therefore, it seems to me that this House should get down to the matter of passing a tax bill and getting it into operation before the end of this year. Now is the time for us to act.

GENERAL MARSHALL

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me reasonable that we, the

Allies, may well have reached the military phase when direction of the Supreme Allied Command should be vested in one man of military stature. In fact, I believe it to be essential to a successful prosecution of the war from now on.

If that man is to be General Marshall—and I consider him preeminently fitted—he should have as much freedom of command as possible. Certainly this in a broad sense should include both the British and American Navies and he should be able to consult with the military heads of the Chinese and Russian Governments.

The question of location of his post of command, to my mind, is secondary. That would be up to him to best determine, and if the selection of a new United States Chief of Staff or Deputy, is necessary it should be made upon his recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote General Marshall as of this morning in saying that he greatly resents all references that have been made to his keyman, General Somervell, on the floor of this House, and in the newspapers, and that he considers it harmful to Army morale and grossly unfair to a truly great American officer.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in his reference to General Marshall and the high-ranking officers of the War Department.

General Marshall called me at my residence this morning to express regret and deep concern at some of the statements that have appeared in local papers and also on the floor of this House. He said it was seriously affecting the war effort and authorized me and other members of the committee to quote him and to express the hope that such statements not be repeated.

He expressed the greatest confidence in General Somervell and also stated that there is complete harmony and co-operation between him and General Somervell and all the other high-ranking generals who have been mentioned on this floor and in the newspapers during the last few days. In this crucial hour I want to express my confidence in General Marshall whom I regard one of the great military leaders of the world today, and I am sure the other Members feel the same way about him. He is entitled to our full confidence, support, and co-operation. He expressed the very fervent hope that in this critical hour our statements be tempered with fairness and tolerance and above all with truth based upon official facts. General Marshall says the appointment, promotion, or assignment of any and all Army officers is without political consideration or influence. The President accepts the recommendation of himself and the Secretary of War.

General Marshall is willing, although a very busy man, to appear before any committee or to speak to any Member of this House about it and he denies the base political charges that have been made, and as the gentleman from New

York [Mr. ANDREWS] states, resents the untruths and exaggerated statements that have been made on this floor and in the press. I think it is time to cut out the bickering and little stuff and back up our great Chief of Staff and get this war over with and our boys back home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, along the line of the discussion that is now taking place with respect to numerous remarks about the War Department, let me say that I spent something like a quarter of an hour in conference with General Marshall this morning, from 7:45 to 8 o'clock. We went over this whole situation thoroughly.

He authorized me to say to anybody interested or in answer to any inquiry that there was complete harmony among the high officials of the War Department and the administration, and that anything that was done was done with his approval.

I think he should have made that statement and I heartily concur in the idea that General Marshall should be permitted to run the War Department as long as he is Chief of Staff. To my mind he is the ideal man for that position. To me he is the most capable man we have had in years as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, and at this time when the Army is expanding so rapidly, when its responsibilities throughout the world are momentous, and when our men are fighting to the death on all world fronts, I know of no man in public life more qualified to head the General Staff of the Army of the United States. The way Gen. George C. Marshall has handled the affairs of the Army in this crucial time gratifies me. In my judgment as long as General Marshall is the Chief of the General Staff of the United States Army we are in safe hands. I have found it wise in the past to follow the advice of this great military leader and for the duration of this war and until we achieve victory as we surely will, I shall continue to feel that we are fortunate indeed in our leadership of our armed forces.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, every one of us, every American, have great responsibilities imposed upon us during this particular crisis. Each and every one of us is a Member of a body of 435 persons honored by the people of a district to represent them in the National House of Representatives—435 out of 133,000,000 persons. We in particular have a grave responsibility imposed upon us because we occupy a position of direct responsibility and trust.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned about some of the statements made lately. I am not going to criticize, because to recriminate would not do any good; but I hope that statements made in the future will be with a tolerant regard for our responsibility as American citizens and as Members of the National House of Representatives.

This morning I had an interview with Secretary of War Stimson, not on this matter but on another matter, and during the interview I took occasion to call to his attention certain statements which appeared in the press recently, Secretary Stimson—and he is an honorable gentleman, a fine American, and, although we may not agree with him in all things, every one of us respect him as a gentleman and as a fine American and a fine public official—Secretary Stimson stated this, and I quote him:

The President has absolutely refrained from interfering in any way with the War Department and in the choice of any generals of the United States Army, and in their assignments to duty. The President has followed the advice of his military advisers in the consideration of all questions of strategy which have governed the war, and so far as his intrusion in any political or personal way it has been absolutely nonexistent.

He also said I was authorized to say that the President—and I know this personally, so I did not have to get this information from Secretary Stimson, but he said this to me and I know it personally:

The President has a very high regard for General Marshall and profoundly respects him and his ability.

Let us hope that in the future we shall have no more intolerant expressions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests.

On yesterday, I secured permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert an analysis of veterans' legislation passed at this session of the Congress, which is very far-reaching and involves questions that are daily being propounded to every Member of Congress. This analysis has been prepared by the Veterans' Administration. The Government Printing Office informs me it will cost \$420. Under the circumstances I think it is well worth it and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD under those conditions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD—THE MOST FAVORED CITIZEN IN AMERICA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while practically everyone in the United States

is being taxed to the limit to help finance the war, while we are calling upon everyone to buy bonds and make sacrifices, and while mothers and fathers throughout the land who are shedding tears and offering prayers for the safety of their sons in the service are digging into their meager purses and depriving themselves of many of the mere necessities in order to aid the war effort, we have one citizen of this country who is today favored beyond the dreams of avarice. I refer to Marshall Field 3d, the Chicago playboy. Today he comes into possession of between \$70,000,000 and \$75,000,000 on which he will pay not one cent of income or inheritance taxes.

I have tried for months to reach that estate through a bill which I have prepared and introduced, but have failed to get results. It is not only escaping taxation entirely, but just think of the purpose for which it is being used. It is being used to finance the publication and distribution of PM—that uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker that is waging its daily scurrilous attacks on Cordell Hull, our great Secretary of State, and one of the outstanding statesmen of the world.

This money is being used to finance this publication that is continually attacking and attempting to smear the Members of the Congress of the United States, and stirring up race trouble throughout the land, and it is today encouraging the Negroes of Washington to storm the white restaurant in this Capitol.

All this is being paid for by Marshall Field, the most favored citizen in America, who today comes into possession of this additional amount of \$70,000,000 or \$75,000,000, of which he never earned a nickel, and on which he will not pay one cent of income or inheritance taxes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks two telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

DIVERSION OF COTTON LINTERS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time of the House briefly to call attention to the fact that the Northwest Furniture Manufacturers' Association, representing all of the furniture factories in that area, is very much concerned at the prospective or projected order to be issued by the War Production Board diverting all cotton linters produced in this season not required for chemical and ammunition purposes to the paper and pulp trade on the ground there is a grave shortage of wood pulp for paper manufacture.

The effect of the diversion of cotton linters from the Northwest industries will mean they will have to utilize substitutes which are not practical and which would give the public a poor article. The Northwest furniture manufacturers are engaged almost 100 per cent in the manufacture of mattresses

and varied furnishings for the armed services. The diversion of cotton linters would have a very deleterious effect on the industry.

The following are two telegrams I have received relative to the subject:

TACOMA, WASH., September 28, 1943.

JOHN M. COFFEE,

Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

The Northwest Furniture Manufacturers Association representing majority of furniture factories this area vitally interested in meeting being held today conducted by Harold Boeschstein, War Production Board, room 3006, Railroad Retirement Building, Washington. This meeting held to consider delivery all cotton linters produced this season not required for chemical munition purposes to paper-pulp trade in view of shortage wood pulp for paper manufacture. We were unaware of this meeting until today and if not watched closely may lead to possible contract by Government agency of entire season's production of linters for one or both purposes if decision is rendered permitting all linters not going to chemical munitions industries to paper-pulp trade it would result in no linters being available for bedding and furniture trade, thereby greatly increasing existing difficulties involved in furnishing thousands of war housing units and bedding for armed forces in this and other areas. We believe that contemplated action entirely unnecessary and unfair to furniture and bedding manufacturers who are doing their utmost to furnish essential furniture for war housing and bedding for armed forces. Your support in preventing unfavorable action will be greatly appreciated as it is evident immediate action necessary.

NORTHWEST FURNITURE

MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
RUFUS T. DAVIS.

TACOMA, WASH., September 28, 1943.

JOHN COFFEE,

Representative, Washington, D. C.:

Understand meeting being held by Harold Boeschstein, 3006 Railroad Retirement Building, to secure use of cotton linters while making pulp for paper industry. Such diversion of linters from mattress and furniture business will greatly increase the cost of mattresses to the public and the Government and will interfere with an established practice. Trust you will oppose this move as it will force the use of waste and other substitutes in our business which are not as practical and gives the public a poor article.

LEO GALLAGHER,

Owner, Sound Mattress and Felt Co.

MARSHALL FIELD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] call attention to the fact that Mr. Marshall Field will today come into possession of many millions of dollars. May I say to him that the money is an inheritance that accumulated and was made possible by reason of the business policy and farsightedness of his grandfather many, many years ago, who had confidence in the future progress of Chicago. I further say to the gentleman that the opportunity of

accumulating wealth in Chicago is still there today.

As to the tax upon this inheritance, I will say to the gentleman that every dollar of payment called for by law—whether it be from a city, county, State, or Federal tax office—will be paid. I can assure him that Mr. Field is an honest man and at no time has he been charged with attempting to evade payment of taxes. That cannot be said of many other men who have accumulated wealth.

From time to time Mr. Field has suffered criticism at the hands of the gentleman from Mississippi because the newspapers which he publishes—the New York PM and the Chicago Sun—are fearless in their criticism of persons whose activities warrant the searchlight of publicity and an exposé of conditions inimical to the best interest of the people of our country and to the country itself. Mr. Field has stood foursquare behind that policy. However, I do not wish to infer that I approve of everything that is carried in these papers because I cannot subscribe to some of their articles relative to our great Secretary of State, whom I have had the honor to know for 37 years. He has proven an honest and efficient official in every position in which he has served.

It is also true that PM has criticized some Members of the House, especially those whom it believes have not fully cooperated in the war effort. Both newspapers devote a great deal of space to the colored people of our country and other peoples who have been discriminated against and it is this, perhaps, to which the gentleman from Mississippi mostly vents his resentment. I do not have many colored people in my district and I do not call attention to this matter for political reasons. It does appear, however, that most of them are still being misled in voting the Republican ticket. It is my observation, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to stand here today and say that the colored people in Chicago have conducted themselves properly, they are law abiding, and there have been no such disturbances as have occurred in other cities, and I trust there never will be any.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago for years had only one Chicago morning newspaper which was extremely antagonistic to the New Deal and to the President. To bring home a true and factual presentation of news to the people of Chicago, Mr. Marshall Field, believing in fair play and because of his interests in Chicago, established a Chicago morning newspaper—the Chicago Sun. While I was hopeful that it would be a Democratic daily, it is really independent in its policies and editorials. It prints the truth regardless of who it hits. Yes, it has even published that my record in answering House roll calls is low. I owe nothing to Mr. Marshall Field, but being from Chicago and knowing well the splendid reputation enjoyed by the Field family over a period of many, many years, I feel that the criticisms on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi are unwarranted and not in keeping with a spirit of fair play. I am confident that

if he were to read not only the New York PM, but the Chicago Sun as well, he would come to the conclusion that it is disseminating impartial and unbiased news to the people.

AGAINST THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that my statements made on the floor and given to the press have been misinterpreted, especially the misquoting of letters which I directed to General Hershey, of the Selective Service System, and the replies which I received from him, relative to what I believed to be unfair draft exemptions and opposing the drafting of fathers.

On September 17, 1943, I addressed a letter to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, in which I enclosed a letter which I received from Mr. Harry Alexander Ash, of Chicago. To correct the misquoting of my position, I refer to the letter addressed to General Hershey which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the letter of Mr. Ash which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A3881.

My statement was to the effect that all unmarried men should be drafted, married men without families up to 30 years of age, and men who have married since the beginning of the war up to 25 years of age, and, later on, if necessary, to extend the age limit of this class to 30 years.

I voted for the conscription bill and the selective-service draft bill, but I do not set myself up above the efficient and experienced officers of the Army who know what our soldier requirements should be, and there is no endeavor to force my views upon them. After all, it is their duty and responsibility—and we know it is a grave one—and we must depend upon their knowledge and experience to decide what is required to win the war.

I regret that people do not seem to be aware of the fact that the House voted favorably on the Kilday bill, which provides for the drafting of single men before fathers are drafted into the service. This bill passed the House on April 12 and has been in the Senate for the past 5 months, and I cannot understand why, at this late hour, certain Senators are making such an issue of this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem written by William Stanley Dunford.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the majority leader, at a meeting of the Dorchester Board of Trade, Dorchester, Mass., on September 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an extract from an address made by the Reverend W. W. Judd, on the subject of the church and racial relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ELLISON]?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, first, I should like to suggest to our friends from St. Louis that if they are interested in seeing that their people are adequately fed, it might be well these days, when we do not seem to have so very much to do here in the House, that they could first get behind the Christian Herter bill, that revives the stamp plan for the low-income groups; second, that they help the rural areas to get out of the clutches of the rulings of the O. P. A. and the Food Distribution Administration and other governmental agencies that evidently are not interested in the spirit of the law or in the word of the law; third, provide a food-production program that will produce food in abundance instead of the one we have had up to this time; and, fourth, help pass House Joint Resolution 155, that will, or should, help provide additional feeds.

With that constructive idea in mind, I have written today to Chester Bowles, evidently Director of the O. P. A., as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER BOWLES,
Director, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Assuming that you would welcome constructive suggestions in connection with the operations of the O. P. A. I am taking this opportunity of expressing to you some of the suggestions which I obtained during the 2 months of close contact which I had with the county O. P. A.'s and the citizens of the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District.

The public seems to feel that the O. P. A. has shown signs in the past of being more interested in making America over than it is in making our country strong and have lately shown more desire to put over their schemes and controlling profits than they have been in helping to produce and distribute equally the food of the Nation. However, there is a prevailing sympathy for, and support of, the objectives of the O. P. A. The public feels there is a need to protect the weak from the strong and the man without the price from certain individuals and groups who have the price.

If the O. P. A. were properly administered it could command the respect, cooperation, and admiration of the people.

A few of the suggestions obtained in a district largely agricultural, where the rural people have not had any E flags for their most excellent contributions to the war effort, are as follows:

1. Much more satisfactory results would be obtained if the spirit of the law, as well as the word of the law, were followed by the most numerous employees of the O. P. A.

Section 2, paragraph (h) of the Price Control Act is as follows: "The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act."

It is more apparent each day that the war effort would be helped if all O. P. A. employees in high and low places, showed more familiarity with this section of the law.

You no doubt are familiar with the pressure groups that tried to have the O. P. A. enforce grade labeling in spite of the above mentioned paragraph of the Price Control Act. You no doubt are familiar with the fact that high policy making officials of the O. P. A. itself, like Dr. Galbraith, appeared before the Agricultural Committee of the House and tried to justify grade labeling in spite of this section of the law.

2. The county O. P. A. in rural sections feel, and it apparently is in keeping with the facts, that the O. P. A. rulings were formulated largely from the urban standpoint. For example, no adequate provision is made for emergency needs and demands for meat for threshing, silo filling and potato digging. Sugar for these same emergency needs has not been provided equally in adjoining counties, resulting in unnecessary ill feeling. Country butchers and farmers have been harassed by illegal, senseless rulings by letter from minor officials on the pay rolls of other Federal agencies and your organization is being held responsible and being criticized when it had no part in the high-handed, non-sensical performances of these little people in big places.

3. While the O. P. A. is supposed to be distributing food equally to all groups of our citizens, this is not being done. The way it is being handled now is, for the lack of a more expressive and permissible term, most ridiculously unfair. The man with the price gets about what he wants. The average man with a family has to pay points for the cheap meats such as bologna, side pork, sowbelly and even a lowly soupbone, while the man with the price can provide himself with the choice meats of the land. As long as the man with the price can obtain his fill of the choicest meats without points, it would appear that since these cheaper cuts are largely consumed by people doing manual labor, it would be only fair to remove these points from the soupbones, bologna, side pork, and sowbelly. Why does the O. P. A. support a program that allows people with the price to buy unlimited quantities of fluid milk, but rations evaporated milk, cheese, and butter, which are made from fluid milk?

4. My fourth suggestion is to immediately amend the ruling in regard to farm butchering where the farmers live in villages and cities and who supervise their own farms. Mr. Maurice Wolk of the O. P. A. advises me that such a change in rulings is under consideration. The sooner this amendment is made the better.

5. The roll-back of butter is having and will continue to have a harmful influence on the war food program. Production of butter is not being maintained. This roll-back of butter has resulted in less powdered skim milk so needed at this time. The O. P. A. and the W. F. A. will have to answer to public opinion for the disruption of the war food program. There is a very evident desire to roll back the bureaus here in Washington.

6. There is still too much of a demonstration of the passion to ration instead of a correct approach to attain the real objectives of the O. P. A.

7. My contacts with the county O. P. A.'s convinces me that the county O. P. A. boards can be depended upon for a more practical approach than the rulings handed down from Washington. There is too much of an attitude that all integrity and all intelligence emanates from Washington when the facts are that the county O. P. A. boards are composed of men with much more practical experience and business experience, than most of the men giving them the orders from Washington.

8. The rural people feel there has been altogether too much emphasis put on inflation as far as the food producers are concerned. They feel that their gross annual incomes are not such a threat to inflation. They feel that the only time inflation is mentioned is when the low income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. They know that Federal employees receiving from \$2,900 to \$12,000 a year had an increase in salary to meet the increased cost of living without a word of publicly recorded protest from James Byrnes, Marvin Jones, Fred Vinson, the O. P. A. or the W. L. B., so they can see no reason to be overly disturbed as to the effect of their meager net incomes on the inflation spiral. Since only 40 percent of the farm homes even have electric lights and since only one out of ten of the farm homes has a bath tub, they are rather tired of hearing people with five to fifty times their net incomes, and with two to five times their hourly wages, accusing them of causing inflation.

9. While some citizens seemed to feel that the O. P. A. was increasing its pay rolls for political purposes, most thinking people realize that this cannot be done without an unfavorable public reaction. There are so many sons and daughters in the armed forces, the public will not tolerate cheap political activities.

I note in the press that a prominent office holder from Oklahoma has written you advising that the O. P. A. is liable to lose the election in 1944. I am not so interested in the influence of the O. P. A. on any political party, as I am interested in seeing it used as an agency to help win the war. It is for that reason that I oppose the activities that are so harmful to the war food program.

10. The O. P. A. is blamed for situations that are the result of rulings by other Federal agencies. In fact the most irritating, unlawful rulings and proposals I observed during the recess of Congress recently, were issued by the War Food Administration and other governmental agencies, and the O. P. A. was being blamed for them. I realize that you have inherited the responsibilities of the O. P. A. and none of these suggestions are written with any personal reference to any individual.

We should have a coordination of agencies or we are apparently not going to live up to our obligations in producing the food for the war and distributing it fairly to our own people. The war food program needs the cooperation of all groups. It needs this cooperation very, very badly.

I trust you will accept this letter in the spirit in which it is meant and hoping to have the privilege of making your acquaintance, I am

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina.
Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina.
Mr. Speaker, I deem the occasion an appropriate one to express some approbation of another great servant of the people of the United States. I have listened with great pleasure to the defense, as you might call it, of General Marshall and the great group of generals that surround him and other officials; and, representing the people of one of the 435 districts of this Republic represented here, and, I believe, a majority of the people of the United States, I want to say, God bless the Commander in Chief of our armies and navies, the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the greatest leader that ever carried any people through a great conflagration in all history.

PUERTO RICO—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
(H. DOC. NO. 304)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

When sovereignty over Puerto Rico was transferred from Spain to the United States in 1899, the Treaty of Paris did not settle the exact position of Puerto Rico in the orbit of American sovereignty. It left that for determination by the Congress of the United States. After a brief interval of military government, the Foraker Act of 1900 established a framework of colonial government. Under it the legislative assembly was given rather limited powers; and the Governor and an appointed executive council held the real substance of authority. The inhabitants were to be citizens of Puerto Rico—American nationals, but not citizens.

In 1917 the Puerto Ricans received full American citizenship. At the same time the Congress, by the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, created a full-fledged legislature, and provided for a much greater participation by Puerto Ricans in the executive department of the government, reserving to the President the power of appointment of only the Governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education, the auditor, and the justices of the supreme court. This action of the Congress in 1917 bound Puerto Rico much more closely to the United States, and provided a substantial advance in local self-government.

During the 45 years which have passed since the occupation of the island by the United States the economic situation of the Puerto Rican people, although materially improved in some respects, has not changed in essential character. Instead of development toward economic self-reliance, there has been a steady tendency to become more dependent upon outside markets for disposal of the single great crop—sugar—and upon outside sources for food, clothing, building mate-

rials, and most of the other necessities. Partly because of economic and geographical factors and partly because of tariff preferences and shipping laws, these relationships are by now almost wholly with the continental United States.

The population of Puerto Rico has increased from 950,000 to about 2,000,000, making this one of the most densely inhabited areas on earth. Depending upon the obligation implied by our active participation in their development, Puerto Ricans have been encouraged, insofar as they could, to try to attain American standards of life. Wages in Puerto Rico, for instance, are several times as high as those in nearby islands not under our flag; literacy is much higher than in other Caribbean islands; the percentage of those who speak English has grown progressively in every decade; our agencies of public health have made inroads on diseases endemic in the island; and serious attempts have been and are being made to provide better housing and to raise the levels of nutrition.

During the 45 years of our sovereignty the elements of world military and naval strategy have changed also. When the island was first brought under our flag, the Panama Canal had not yet been dug, and the airplane had not yet been invented. The Caribbean was something of a backwater in the broad current of world affairs. When the present war became imminent, however, it was obvious that the chain of islands running in a great arc from Florida to the shoulder of South America, enclosing the Caribbean Sea, formed a vast natural shield for the Panama Canal, suited in distance and conformation to the uses of the military plane. And of this island shield, Puerto Rico is the center. Its possession or control by any foreign power—or even the remote threat of such possession—would be repugnant to the most elementary principles of national defense.

It has long been the policy of the Government of the United States progressively to reinforce the machinery of self-government in its Territories and island possessions. The principles for which we are now fighting require that we should recognize the right of all our citizens—whether continental or overseas—to the greatest possible degree of home rule and also of participation in the benefits and responsibilities of our Federal system.

Puerto Ricans of all political parties, however divergent their views as to the political future of the island, are united in asking for the right to elect their own Governor. I believe that they are entitled to it.

The Congress will recall that on March 9 of this year, I recommended to it "that it consider as soon as possible an amendment of the organic law of Puerto Rico to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor and to redefine the functions and powers of the Federal Government and of the Government of Puerto Rico, respectively." In order to assist in framing the required legislation, in case the Congress should decide to grant this power to the people of Puerto Rico, I appointed a committee composed

of an equal number of Puerto Ricans and continental residents. I requested them to make a study of the amendments to the organic act necessary to authorize the election of a Governor and to redefine the relationships of the Federal and Insular Governments affected thereby.

That committee met in Washington almost daily for 3 weeks this last summer. It has sent me a full report of its recommendations in the form of a proposed bill and a summary statement of such bill.

I am forwarding this report of the committee to the Congress for consideration by them. The legislation was drawn by the committee itself, and I am submitting it as a possible guide for such action as the Congress may decide to take.

Under this bill the people of Puerto Rico would be given an opportunity for the free exercise of the powers of local self-government in all three branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. There would be reserved to the President the power to veto only such measures passed by the legislature as were beyond the proper field of local self-government. There would be a United States Commissioner General in Puerto Rico upon whom would devolve the responsibility for the execution of the laws of the United States, and for the coordination and supervision of the activities of Federal civilian agencies, and their correlation with the activities of insular agencies. He would also have authority to require reports of all activities of the insular government for transmittal to the President through the Secretary of the Interior. The fiscal relationship of the insular government to the Federal Government would not be altered, nor would the ultimate power of Congress to legislate for the Territory. The people of the island would, however, be given assurance of the intention of Congress to obtain the concurrence of the people of the island before imposing upon them any further changes in the organic act.

There is no reason why their Governor and other officials should continue to be appointed from without. At this stage of Puerto Rican development the withholding of this right is no longer necessary. There is no question of Puerto Ricans' ability now to administer their own internal affairs and to assume the attendant responsibility.

It is recommended by the report of the committee that this fact be recognized at once. I agree that this should be done and suggest that the Congress should consider it as a matter of right and justice for Puerto Ricans.

As to the future, it is not proposed that the political development of Puerto Rico be left to chance. On the contrary, it is recommended by the committee that a continuing joint advisory council, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Interior, be appointed to conduct continuing economic and political studies of all the elements of the Puerto Rican situation and of American necessities, to guide us for the future. This council must report at least once during the life of each Congress.

In addition to the Secretary of the Interior, the council would consist of the

Governor of Puerto Rico and the Commissioner General, who shall serve ex officio, and also four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, and five persons to be appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The government of Puerto Rico should not be static; it should be changed and developed as conditions warrant. It is equally important that the economic situation of the Puerto Ricans should be improved. I am confident that with patience and cooperation both these objectives can be attained.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 28, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FREE SPEECH IN AMERICA

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take this time today to speak upon the farm problem. I had intended to urge that the ceiling price upon corn of \$1.07 a bushel be removed so that the farmers in the East, the poultrymen and the dairymen, might get some of the middle-western corn. We have a very desperate situation in the Eastern States, particularly in New York and in my section, and I propose to speak upon that issue next week.

Instead, today I want to answer a resolution which was adopted by the American Legion at its national convention in Omaha, criticizing me for allegedly abusing my franking privilege.

No one is a more loyal supporter of the Legion than I am and will continue to be in spite of this action, which is totally erroneous upon its part, and which was taken without affording me any opportunity to answer these false charges and implications.

Since, however, the American Legion has inadvertently permitted persons who have been engaged in a concerted smear campaign against me and other pre-war noninterventionists to use that organization for their own political purposes, and caused the adoption of a resolution based on an utterly false premise, wherein I was censured for "abuse of the congressional franking privilege," I wish to take this opportunity to give the facts to the House.

In the first place I want to state again, and again, and again that I have never permitted anyone to use my frank to send out any speeches that were prepared by someone else; only my own speeches have been distributed, and they have always been 100-percent American.

My outspoken opposition to Gestapo methods in America, and my efforts to uphold the Bill of Rights and the Constitution has invoked the enmity and animosity of certain persons who would destroy every vestige of freedom of speech in America. I consider it an honor to be attacked by such sources as Walter Winchell, the Washington Post, the Communist Daily Worker, and PM, but deplore the fact that such a great American organization as the Legion can be made use of to smear its own members without a hearing. However, since these persons

have now infiltrated into one of our greatest veterans organizations, and have used its great prestige for their own purposes, I feel I should again present the facts to the Congress and the American people.

I emphatically deny the alleged abuse of the franking privilege as set forth in the American Legion resolution. Had there been any opportunity to present the facts to the Legion committee, I am confident that I would have easily convinced them of the falsity of these manufactured charges; but no such opportunity was afforded me. The resolution was sponsored by yet-unknown individuals and aimed against me and other Members of Congress who happened to oppose our entrance into war before Pearl Harbor, and who have been unafraid to stand up and fight for freedom of speech in America, while supporting all war measures since war was declared.

It is a sad commentary that such an organization as the American Legion—of which I have been proud to be a member since World War No. 1 and was chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the preamble to the American Legion constitution which has never been changed one iota to the present time—should permit itself to be used even inadvertently for political and smear purposes. It is even more to be deplored that it should permit its great name to be linked with any effort designed to destroy free speech in America and to deny to American citizens the rights guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

I also want to reply to an editorial appearing in the Washington Post. In its editorial, dated September 25, 1943, the Post, as usual, distorts the facts concerning a speech I sent out last summer in behalf of the freedom of speech, on which the American Legion resolution was based, and quotes section 335 of the United States Code, that—

It shall be unlawful for any person entitled under the law to use of a frank to lend said frank or permit its use by any committee, organization, or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any such committee, organization, or association.

By this inference, it is claimed that I used my frank for such purposes, which is contrary to the fact. No person, organization, committee, or association has ever used my frank in this manner, and I do not even know the individual C. Leon De Aryan to whom the Post refers, nor do I know of any organization or association with which he may be connected.

I did make a speech in the House in behalf of the preservation of the freedom of speech in America—mind you, not in time of war but in peacetime—as was clearly set forth in this speech—April 6, 1943, in behalf of H. R. 2352, proposing amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act and to make it conform to the Bill of Rights and the Constitution in time of peace.

My position is that if anyone desires to send out my speeches and wishes to join in combating the efforts of any Federal agency to deprive American citizens of their privileges under the Bill

of Rights and the Constitution, I shall welcome their support and am always glad to have them quote from or send out any speeches I have made on that vital issue. I had several thousand copies of my remarks printed, at my own expense, and sent them out to anyone who requested copies, already inserted and sealed in envelopes, in accordance with the time-honored practice and custom of Members of the House and Senate.

Anyone, white or colored, Protestant, Catholic, or Jew, Republican, Democrat, New Dealer, Socialist, or Communist, arrested, indicted, or convicted, in jail or out, may, as far as I am concerned receive or send out any of my speeches, because they are good American doctrine, in the interest of the United States, and 100-percent American.

There is not one word—and I challenged anyone to prove otherwise—that is even by indirection subversive or un-American.

I want to quote from the speech that the American Legion, the Washington Post, the Daily Worker, and the PM have objected to, as I do not know of any speech of which I am more proud or believe is more needed at the present time. I only wish I had enough money myself to send out a million copies in the Nation. If there was ever a 100-percent American speech, it is this one. It refers only to peacetime and does not apply after war has been declared. It in no way prevents the prosecution of persons for unlawful acts, and merely endeavors to protect the right of free speech and of a free press in America in time of peace.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert extracts from that speech which I delivered in the House on Tuesday, April 6, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. The extracts to which I refer—and I only wish I had time to read the entire speech—are as follows:

The peacetime sedition law of 1940 was aimed specifically at preventing the distribution of handbills and propaganda to cause disaffection and mutiny on board warships and disobedience and desertion in our armed forces; and should not, by any stretch of interpretation by the Department of Justice, be applied to editorials or to statements and speeches by American citizens exercising their constitutional right and ancient fireside privilege of commenting on or criticizing the administration, the President, the New Deal, the foreign policies of the President and of Congress prior to Pearl Harbor, or racial or religious issues, or the conduct of the war.

It is utterly preposterous to attempt to twist and distort the 1940 act into indicting and bringing to trial opponents of the administration's foreign policies or of President Roosevelt, or anti-New Dealers, anti-Communists, or anti-Semites.

In a letter written to Mrs. John Adams, written at the end of his first term in the Presidency, Thomas Jefferson stated:

"I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law because I considered and now consider that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image, and that

it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage as it would have been to rescue from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image." (Thomas Jefferson, by Albert Jay Nock, p. 230.)

The golden calf in the present instance is the foreign policy of the New Deal administration prior to Pearl Harbor, and those who failed to fall down and worship it before Pearl Harbor are being charged, and in some instances, indicted under the provisions of the present-day Sedition Act, 1940.

Fair-minded Americans, regardless of party affiliations, will never remain silent and permit freedom of speech or a free press—without which free America ceases to exist—to be curbed and gagged, or opponents of the foreign policies of President Roosevelt prior to Pearl Harbor—who numbered 100,000,000—sent to jail through bold distortion of the peacetime sedition law and the intent of the Congress.

If American citizens, clergymen, editors, writers, and crackpots or cranks from all parts of the Nation can be brought to Washington and tried for expressing their noninterventionist and anti-New Deal views prior to Pearl Harbor, half of Congress and 80 percent of the American people could be sent to prison under such a Gestapo procedure.

I am informed that there is a group of anti-Semites among the 34 Americans indicted. I do not approve of their words or actions, as I believe there should be no religious test under the Constitution, and that all American citizens, regardless of race or color, have a right to their own religious convictions. But while anti-Semitism is un-American, I know of no Federal law or constitutional provision that prohibits freedom of discussion of racial and religious issues, as much as I deplore them. It certainly was not the intent of Congress to write any such restriction or limitation into the Alien Registration and Sedition Act of July 28, 1940.

This issue is so important that it far exceeds all party lines. It is a great American issue, involving the most fundamental and precious of all American rights and liberties—that of freedom of speech. No sacrifice is too great to safeguard freedom of speech and of the press—symbols of freedom in America. We are fighting a war all over the world for these very principles and must not permit them to be destroyed here at home.

To sum up, this speech and the legislation I proposed coincides very closely with an amendment offered by me on the floor of the House to another bill, which was adopted, and reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any citizen or citizens, or any newspaper or other publications, at any time, from freely discussing or openly criticizing the domestic or foreign policies of the administration or the Federal Government, or any public official, or from discussing or criticizing any existing or proposed law, regulation, directive, or Executive order.

The following resolution passed by the Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, of Newburgh, N. Y., the largest post in my district, was adopted by a unanimous vote, with one single exception. That post has sent its resolution of protest through the channels to the national organization. I did not see it until it appeared in the Newburgh News. I knew nothing about it except as I read it in the local newspaper and as

it was handed to me afterward, because I was not in my district at the time.

The resolution reads as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
JUDSON P. GALLOWAY POST, No. 152,
Newburgh, N. Y.

"Whereas the American Legion, in national convention assembled, at Omaha, Nebr., has passed a resolution questioning the patriotism and loyalty of one of our post members; and

"Whereas the said target of this attack, HAMILTON FISH, has proven that his patriotism and loyalty to his country in war and in peace are beyond reproach; and

"Whereas the said HAMILTON FISH was one of the founders of the American Legion and coauthor of the preamble to its constitution; and

"Whereas the record will prove that he was one of the first of our national legislators to fight the subversive groups forming the Communist Party in the United States, and that he further did much to crush their early attempts to defame and disrupt our form of government and in so doing he did expose their plans and purposes: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, Newburgh, N. Y., wish to be recorded in protest to this action, and we further resolve that no such action should be taken in a free and democratic organization like the American Legion against one of its members without first giving the said member a hearing. Loyalty and service to the American Legion and the United States of America deserves fairer treatment, and this action appears like an attempt to cooperate with those elements which are spreading disunity in the Nation in time of war, and with those groups which would smother free speech and thus create in the United States of America the very type of dictatorship which the war is being fought to destroy; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded through the necessary channels to the national commander of the American Legion for consideration and appropriate action."

The above resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of Judson P. Galloway Post, No. 152, the American Legion, Newburgh, N. Y., on Thursday evening, September 23, 1943.

IRVING NESS,

Commander.

JAMES M. FLANAGAN,

Adjutant.

I have received other resolutions from war veterans' organizations along the same line. After I read in a New York newspaper the resolution adopted by the Legion at Omaha, I gave out the following statement which I propose to read in full to the Members of the House of Representatives, as it involves the right of free speech and the use of the franking privilege of every Member of Congress.

It is more in sorrow than in anger that I have read in the newspapers that the Legion, a great American organization, of which I am proud to be a member, has inadvertently been used to carry on a political and partisan smear campaign by repeating charges more than 3 years old, that I permitted my congressional frank to be used to spread un-American or subversive propaganda by the America First Committee, and George Sylvester Viereck, without one iota of evidence or any hearing on my part whatsoever.

Both these charges are completely and totally false, and I denounced them as manufactured lies years ago. Neither the America First Committee nor Mr. Viereck ever asked to use my congressional frank, or ever used it to send out any subversive speeches, nor did either write or suggest any speeches for me. I think everybody knows that I write my own speeches, and there is not a subversive or un-American thought in any speech I ever made in Congress or elsewhere. I never met nor have I seen Mr. Leon de Aryan, of San Diego, who is alleged to have addressed and sent out one or more of my speeches in April of this year entitled "Making the Peacetime Alien Sedition Law Conform to Bill of Rights and the Constitution," dealing almost entirely with the preservation of free speech and free press in time of peace and not affecting the situation in any way after war has been declared. I challenge anyone to find a single un-American word, thought, or ideal in that speech. I sent one to every Member of Congress, and as soon as I can get more printed I will send a copy to every American Legion delegate to the Omaha Convention, and will eat my hat if there is anything subversive in it unless free speech has become un-American. The Legion evidently did not know that my proposed free-speech bill was not effective in time of war. We are fighting a war to maintain free speech all over the world, and the sole purpose of my bill was to maintain it in America in peacetime. That is the fire-side privilege of every American citizen. I do not know without checking up how many of these speeches on free speech and a free press were mailed out, but there were not very many as I recollect that the printing bill was under \$50. There were some favorable editorials and comments on it throughout the Nation at the time, and I received numerous letters of commendation. I hold no brief for Mr. De Aryan, as I know nothing about him except that under American jurisprudence no American is guilty of any unlawful act until convicted. I am told that his newspaper, the Broom, which I do not subscribe to and have no connection with, is still being published, and if it were subversive it would have been closed by the Government long ago.

It would be interesting to know, and I propose to find out, who originated this false and scurrilous attack. I have my own ideas now, but will take steps to ascertain the facts and to act accordingly.

I shall be glad to cooperate with the American Legion to prevent any abuse of the franking privilege. I doubt if there is a single legionnaire who has more openly and more consistently opposed subversive and un-American activities during the 22 years I have been in Congress, and will continue to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Under previous order of the House heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for 15 minutes.

REALITIES CONCERNING THE POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are 12 fundamental points upon which it is important that we be advised concerning our foreign policy. It is important that we be advised of these 12 fundamental points, because we, the American taxpayers, will have to pay the bill. We and our children and our children's children will have to toil and sweat, sacrifice, deny ourselves, and endure privations in order to meet even a comparatively small part of the post-war plans of some who would impose upon us those which they have in mind.

These 12 fundamental points require our careful study because they vitally affect our future and the fate of coming American generations.

The first point is that, of course, the United States will fulfill all of her proper and actual responsibilities in and to the post-war world. Those obligations will not necessarily be what some group, seeking world power, may say they will be, or what some individual, seeking world renown, may want to make them.

The second point is that it is too early to blueprint in detail what those responsibilities will be. We do not yet know what kind of a post-war world will confront us. We do not know whether the war both on the Atlantic and the Pacific will end simultaneously, or whether there will be a year or two years or a longer period between the terminations of the war across the Atlantic and our war on the Pacific.

We do not know what conditions of destruction, of epidemics, of internal revolutions, of possible disagreements as to peace objectives between the Allies themselves may develop.

The third point is that the American people, 132,000,000 of them, manifestly cannot undertake to provide a post-war United States W. P. A., unlimited, for all the ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed millions of the rest of the world. There are more than 2,000,000,000 people in the world—World Almanac, 1943—and, outside of America, probably more than half of them would come within the category of the ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed.

The fourth point is that the people of America cannot force the Atlantic Charter and its "four freedoms" down the throats of the other peoples of the world, even though we have the financial resources, the will, and the power to seriously attempt it. We do not definitely know what Joe Stalin, the dictator of Russia, thinks of the "four freedoms." He has never explicitly stated his views but we do know it is his intention, when the war is ended, to incorporate in the Union of Soviet Republics the so-called Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, together with part of Poland, without regard to the wishes of the peoples thereof. This is hardly in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms." However, we do know that the British do not want the "four freedoms" under the terms of the Atlantic Charter extended throughout India nor in many other

areas of the British Empire. Prime Minister Churchill made this very clear when he said in London on September 9, 1941, I quote:

The joint declaration does not qualify in any way the various statements of (British) policy which have been made from time to time about the developments of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire.

Also, when the Prime Minister stated to the Lord Mayor of London on November 10, 1942. I quote:

Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

The fifth point is, that not we alone, but we and our allies, including valorous, suffering China, will have to determine what the needs of the post-war world are, both from the standpoint of the victorious Allies, and of the defeated Axis peoples. It must be obvious to anyone thinking clearly on this subject that there may be wide differences of view to be reconciled, there may be a wide diversity of interests to be reconciled, and there undoubtedly will be a wide diversity of hatreds and prejudices which will have to be composed before we can have a post-war world of peace. That means, not some summary decisions on the part of these self-appointed, little-understanding planning groups in the United States, but compromise between the conflicting and bitter differences which existed among and within certain nations of the world before the beginning of the war.

The sixth point, what any enlightened American citizen already knows, is that only a safe, sound, free, solvent America can help the rest of the world or any part of it back to peace, sanity, and prosperity. No one ever saved a drowning man by jumping in and drowning with him.

The seventh point is that the greatest service we can render to the cause of democracy is to prove to the world, in the case of our own country, that democracy can stand up and operate effectively, and continue to exist under the stresses of war, as well as in the blessings of peace. If we fail to do this, then government of the people, for the people, and by the people will have failed in the world.

The eighth point is that any attempt on the part of the United States and the other Allied Powers to compel the American or the British form of government in the smaller countries would be imperialism. It is imperialism that our men and women on the fighting lines all over the world are now struggling to resist and destroy. Why emulate Hitler?

The ninth point is that we can aid other peoples in the world in securing an opportunity to adopt and adapt our American way, only insofar as it may be suited to their cultural and economic viewpoints and conditions. Beyond that we cannot go without departing from democracy and entering the field of imperialism. We must not forget that imperialism may be attempted or promoted through bribery by means of goods and

services, as well as by force of arms and aggression.

The tenth point is that the extravagant and irresponsible promises now being made by these self-appointed post-war planners, that the United States will undertake reformation of their economic and cultural conditions in the other countries of the world, to prescribe their methods of government, to regulate their wages and working conditions, their living conditions, their educational systems, and so forth, cannot possibly be carried out by the United States. Such irresponsible promises can and will result in leaving the other peoples of the world disappointed, angry, and with their faith in the integrity and stability of American promises and policies seriously impaired or destroyed. In which case we would emerge from this terrible war with only the enmity of the other nations of the world as our return for our vast sacrifices in human lives and happiness, and in financial treasure. This condition we must avoid.

The eleventh point is that Congress must move to set up some sort of supervision, perhaps by a Joint Congressional Council, or Commission, to investigate for and to advise the Congress as to its proper course of action in the final determination of this Nation's post-war policies.

The twelfth and final point is that the designs of these self-appointed post-war planners to continue, after the war, to spread billions of dollars' worth of American goods and services—American sweat, toil, and resources—among the other peoples of the world, would, if permitted, bankrupt America, enslave our own people, denude us of the necessities by which we support our own American cultural and living levels, and encourage the other peoples of the world to look to us as a paternalistic provider for all the improvident of the world, instead of exerting their own ingenuity and energy in providing for their own necessities.

America—a free, sound, solvent America—can help the other peoples of the world to help themselves. It is impossible logically to conceive that our responsibilities to the post-war world could possibly go beyond that point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 15 minutes.

ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose most Members of the House had an experience similar to my own during the Congressional recess, when we were privileged to sojourn at home for a period of 60 days and ascertain the temper and the general attitude of the people over the impositions of government. I am satisfied that the admonitions that came to you were similar to those that came to me. The people would say, "I hope when you return to Washington that you will get some action about a good many of these regulations, these rules and procedures that weigh down so heavily upon the American people." We have now

been in session a little while, and nothing has eventuated. I feel just a little disappointed over our inaction. I do not know what you, as Members of this House, are going to do, but I know what I am going to do. I am going to make some effort at it at least, and before I come to the conclusion I want to reach in the 15 minutes that are at my disposal, I think I ought to begin in a rather roundabout fashion and first remind you that the departments are already preparing their estimates for the Budget Bureau, for appropriations for the fiscal year 1945. There is no great magic about that. Every agency, every department of government is now working and has probably concluded its preliminary draft of estimates of what money they will need for the fiscal year 1945. They will then proceed to present these estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. Experts will be assigned by the Bureau, and they will go over these estimates very carefully.

When they are finally completed they will go to the White House and the President will be consulted, and when they are put into final form they will be ready for inclusion in the printed Budget of the United States, with some 1,100 pages that will be submitted to us in January. When the estimates are submitted, the appropriation bills will also be submitted therewith. Then hearings will begin in the Appropriations Committee so that the Congress may determine how much or how little shall be allocated to the different agencies of Government for the next fiscal year, which begins on July 1, 1944.

I have tried to summarize the general attitude of the Appropriations Committee, and the general attitude of the House as those measures are presented and it appears to be about like this: Our attitude generally with respect to appropriation bills is an attitude of protest. We find there that we have an instrumentality whereby we can discipline agencies of government when we cannot contrive it in any other way. If O. P. A., for instance, indulges in excesses and abuses and gets out capricious regulations of one kind or another, invades the sanctity of a man's business and seizes his books and papers, there are only two or three different approaches we can take. We could try to get the act repealed. You know and I know the difficulty of getting an act repealed when it has been established on the statute books and has been placed there pursuant to the demand of the people to do something about controlling and regulating prices. Nor is such an approach the answer as a general thing, the act itself cannot be repealed. So we voice and we articulate our protest when the appropriation bills come in. I certainly expressed my views early this year in the form of an amendment to strike \$35,000,000 from the O. P. A. estimate. It was approved by the House. I also expressed my protest early in the year by submitting an amendment to the House to require that every price director have 5 years of experience, which amendment passed this House and was later modified in the Sen-

ate, but which is receiving some attention from the O. P. A. at present.

So the thing I want to point out first of all is that we appear content to wait until January 1, when the appropriation bills come on the floor of the House, and then bespeak our protest and seek to exercise some kind of discipline over these agencies either by writing restrictions into the bills, or by amending them so that they will not have as much money to spend.

Well, it is all very interesting as an attitude, but why not some action now? It is all very interesting to protest in that fashion, but I sometimes wonder whether or not we get anywhere, whether or not there ought not be some far more basic approach. I say the people in the country have been rather hostile about a great many things. Every day divulges new experiences with the regulatory agencies of government. I have one that came to me this morning. Sometime in June, I happened to be in Minnesota and there I saw a chap who wrote me this week with reference to an experience with O. P. A. He had a refrigerator to sell and he inserted a classified ad in the newspaper. The next morning before he got out of bed his telephone began to ring and there were several people who wanted to buy that electric ice box. The price he quoted was \$125. A gentleman who used to live in Illinois called him and said, "Don't sell it until you see me. I will see you at the office when you get there." When the prospective vendor came to the office here was the prospective vendee. He said, "I will give you \$100 for the box." He said, "I will take \$125." So they finally made a deal at \$110. Now, he used the ice box for 66 whole days and it was quite satisfactory, and then the O. P. A. called up. They said, "Did you know you had violated the law?" He said, "In what respect?" They said, "You charged \$110 for a used electric ice box and the O. P. A. regulations require that you should charge only \$21."

So he consulted with the vendee. It may be that the buyer reported to O. P. A. He said, "I guess you will have to send that ice box back. I have got two of them but I will not sell it for \$21, so you send the box back and I will give you your check for \$110."

He said, "No, I propose to keep the box and you can give me the difference between \$110 and \$21."

So now he is being cited to the legal section of his State for having violated an O. P. A. regulation.

I have another that came in the mail this morning, in response to a little news article that went out with reference to an amendment I introduced the other day for judicial review of O. P. A. proceedings. This gentleman lives in Austin, Tex. He is in the business of making and selling fence posts. He said, "In Austin, Tex., the ceiling is 10 cents." He said, "Across the Arkansas River, just across the river, the ceiling is 16 cents. How do they expect me to stay in business?" That is a fair question.

That can be multiplied a thousand times to indicate the fractiousness of the

people at the present time with the regulations that are in effect. You know and I know when we came away from home they said to us, "Now, you go down to Washington and do something about it." I have been here since the 14th of September and we have done nothing about it yet.

So I propose, first of all, to make my very articulate protest, and then come to what I think is a conclusion and a remedy on the matter. Now, when you put together the growing controversy that has been in the air in recent months, and for that matter in recent years, what is it? It is a controversy between the lawmaking power of the Government and those to whom we delegate that power, who have engaged in the excessive exercise of the power. When all is said and done, that is the whole story. We are amenable to and responsible to the people, because they can discipline every last one of us at the polls, but you cannot discipline any Federal administrator at the polls, because he is an appointive officer and is not directly responsive to the electorate. The people look to us for aid in matters of this kind.

The people have only one place to go in order to secure some redress from their grievances and that is here, and we must do something about it unless we are going to confess our remissness to the country. They expect us to be alert to this whole business and they expect the Congress to retrieve its powers and to set up any delegation of power within a framework that is controllable, that is supervisable, and that is understandable to the people.

Mr. Speaker, that is just about the gist of this whole business that presents itself to us as a real problem.

I had an experience, as recorded in a letter very recently, from a very fine representative business in Peoria, when, without any search warrant, without any legal weapon of any kind, three agents of the Office of Price Administration walked into that office and seized the books, and let it appear that he was in violation of his sugar quota. A terrible thing, as a matter of fact, and it is only indicative of the fact that Congress is going to have to deal with this thing summarily and deal with it now.

I propose to file that letter with my friend, Raymond McKeough, the district director of the Office of Price Administration in that section and ask for some kind of corrective action.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot dispose of all these people who are exceeding their authority. It requires a sound, basic remedy. For instance, at the moment there have been developed facts before the Smith committee concerning rent control through the O. P. A. It appears from the interim report of that committee that O. P. A. had been encouraging people to file suits against landlords for the purpose of collecting damages and for the purpose of developing greater friction throughout the country. That is certainly a horrible state of affairs; it does not make for unity; it only develops and increases and aggravates friction in the country and it

is going to have to have some kind of action and must receive that attention soon.

What do we propose to do about it? How can the Congress meet that problem, a problem that grows out of the abuse of power that it has delegated to administrative agencies. Some suggest that we should not delegate those powers. I think, however, that the administrative management is here to stay. The delegation of some power to an administrative agency is absolutely necessary, in my judgment. Let us consider that for a moment. How could the Congress itself make freight rates? We have to give that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

How could we police all the fair-trade practices in industry? Since the Congress could not do it we delegate that power to the Federal Trade Commission.

Congress, of itself, cannot administer the Price Control Act and so there must be a price-control agency.

Our failure lies initially in not carefully delimiting and spelling out the delegated power which an administrative agency shall exercise; secondly, we are not staffed or equipped to follow through and make certain that the intent and spirit of any act is properly carried out; third, we have permitted the free exercise of judicial review to be limited and made ineffective. Thus, when abuses creep in and the rights of people are often ignored, we exercise the only remedy available to us other than the complete repeal of the act and that is to curtail funds and place restrictions on appropriations as a kind of discipline for such an agency. But when all is said and done, it is an unsatisfactory process and does not meet the problem.

What weapon is there; what are we going to do about it? We tried to do something about it once before. A good many of you will remember the efforts of the Congress in enacting the Walter-Logan bill. I am sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, recalls that committee reported a bill, which passed the House and went through the Senate and was vetoed by the President. And, as a result they set up this committee in the Department of Justice in order to explain this whole business of administrative law and make a report.

They did make a report. They sent me their documents. My desk was piled that high with them, and if I read them all it would take me 4 years, I suppose, to read all of the exhibits that have come to me.

Where are we going to find time to do that?

You and I know that the Walter-Logan bill had merit. It started out beautifully, and it wound up in the setting sun of a veto and nothing more has been done about it. We must stop kidding ourselves about it and really do something one way or the other, and I think it is necessary that we start right now.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We all know how important this whole matter of delegated power and the careful supervision of that power by the Congress is going to be when the war is over.

One of the first things to be suggested will be to determine on a public-works program to meet the problem of demobilized veterans and demobilized defense workers, after free enterprise has done its utmost in providing full creative employment. Such a program means the appropriation of public funds and the creation of an administrative agency to administer such funds and the expression of such a program. Will there not be the same business over and over again of coming in here with joint resolutions from the Appropriations Committees delegating broad powers to agencies and giving them several billion dollars and saying, "Let her go, Gallagher." If we do that, we must be responsible for the fruits, and the bitter fruits, that may emanate from that kind of an approach.

What about surplus goods?

We are told that there will be \$50,000,000,000 of surplus war goods. What is going to happen? I assume there will be some kind of an agency to administer their disposition. Under what kind of power? The kind of power that we shall give such an agency here in Congress. So we are going to delegate. Within what limitations? And what rights of review will there be when controversies arise? Consider for a moment the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill on social security. There is one provision in that measure which intrigues me greatly. That is the one to federalize the whole program of unemployment compensation. We have a State-Federal system now. If that bill should prevail in its present form it would mean that there would be a completely federalized compensation system. And then what happens to the rights of review, to the adjudication of controversies that may arise where an employer may be on one side and an employee on the other?

What about all these defense plants that we have built—\$15,000,000,000 of your money and mine that is invested in plants that have been constructed by the Defense Plants Corporation? How will they be administered? I suppose some authority will be set up. Then there must be a delegation of power. What kind of delegation? How broad shall it be? And how far shall it go? And then there comes this whole problem of review all over again where controversies arise. So I am only pointing out to you that as we get into the post-war period this problem of administrative discretion, of administrative latitude is going to be infinitely greater than it is at the present time. Continued friction

between the legislative and executive branch is neither wise nor healthy. Nor was it intended by the founders of this Republic. We must work out a technique which will make the administration of congressional enactments more efficient with a minimum of friction. Let me make this suggestion since my time is running out in order to get the thing crystallized. We had a situation in the city of Peoria recently where three Federal judges heard a case involving O. P. A. Judge Adair, who was once a Member of this House; Federal Circuit Judge Major, who was once a Member of this House; and Judge Briggie. It was a petition for a restraining order. The three-man court listened attentively to the petitioner's counsel and then respectfully and informally advised the petitioner that by a long series of acts Congress has gradually divested the regular Federal courts of jurisdiction and that they could offer no remedy. The O. P. A. Act clearly recited in section 204 that all jurisdiction on regulations and price schedules had been vested in a special court and that this three-man court hearing the case was powerless to afford relief. That is a rather tragic spectacle.

That was the language of Federal Judge Briggie not so very long ago, fairly reproaching the Congress for having divested the regular Federal courts of their jurisdiction.

What did we do in the O. P. A. Act? We set up a special emergency court. What a lure it was and how persuasive was the argument. I reread Mr. Ginsburg's memo to the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with this proposal. He said in effect, "We want a court of experts."

We want to relieve the Federal courts of congestion.

All right. He said:

We are going to make it possible for this court to operate in divisions to make justice accessible to all sections of the country, to every litigant, rich and poor alike.

That was the memorandum filed by O. P. A. with the Banking and Currency Committee when the O. P. A. Act was under consideration. We wrote into that emergency act this provision:

No Federal, circuit, or territorial court shall have jurisdiction over any controversy involving a price regulation or a price schedule.

That went through this body. I voted for it like other Members, although we did make an effort to secure the adoption of the proposal by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] to retain this power in the regular Federal courts. We had the memo from O. P. A. expressing its faith in the emergency court which it proposed. But it has not worked, and people with grievances have a difficult time securing redress of such grievances. We can still retrieve that mistake and make a vigorous effort to restore judicial review to the regular Federal courts so that in truth and in fact, any citizens who is aggrieved by the actions of an administrative agency of Government will have his day in court. Is that asking too much? Is that not the proper

and basic way to meet the excesses of administrative agencies of Government?

Recently I introduced a bill to meet this problem. It is in the nature of an amendment to the O. P. A. Act to restore jurisdiction to Federal courts to review all actions, regulations and schedules of O. P. A. It is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not advised as to whether a hearing will be held or not. Moreover, time is of the essence. Why not get action on this matter without delay.

If no hearing will be held, there is another method open.

I do know there is a bill pending that was introduced by my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], H. R. 2705. It was introduced May 13, 1943. This bill contains a provision reading like this:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination the right of any person to a judicial review of grievances resulting from the promulgation of any order, directive, regulation, finding, or determination under this act shall not be denied.

That is the section of the Wolcott bill in which I am interested. How can we get action on it? If we cannot get a hearing from the Committee on Banking and Currency there is still one other way. I am going to file a discharge petition on Mr. Wolcott's bill, H. R. 2705, yet this afternoon and if you want to help restore judicial review to the regular Federal courts of the country and give the people their day in court in the third branch of Government all I can ask is that you march up to the Clerk's desk at the proper time and affix your signature to the petition. If we discharge the committee it can come to the floor for action. Whenever we deny to the people, an opportunity to go into court for relief from the encroachments of government agencies, we abridge the last best hope of this Nation. Adequate judicial review is after all the answer to the controversy between the Congress and the bureaus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was delayed in reaching the House today. I should like to have heard the barrage that was laid down regarding the subject I am to speak on.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago an authoritative Army publication contained an editorial alleging that powerful political forces had laid careful plans to take over the War Department following the appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, to the post of global commander in chief.

During the following days many newspapers discussed this alleged plot and it was brought out in some detail on the floor of this House by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER]. It was a

matter of common discussion in the Capital.

I point out these facts for the purpose of showing that it had been well aired before I came into the picture last Thursday.

I take the floor today in connection with this matter because I cannot permit administration apologists to put words in my mouth and to misrepresent my position.

At the outset, permit me to make perfectly clear that:

First. I have never directed any criticism, nor linked with any plot, the reportedly proposed appointment of General Marshall as global chief of staff. I have understood for sometime that General Marshall has been the accepted choice of the leaders of the United Nations for the post of supreme commander when the final blow is to be struck against the Axis Powers.

Second. I have made no criticism of the Commander in Chief of our Army in connection with this proposed promotion of General Marshall. In fact, I said in my remarks on Thursday:

I prefer to think his promotion is a fine recognition of General Marshall's ability.

Now, after the matter had been thoroughly discussed by newspaper and radio commentators and editorial writers, I took the position that where there is smoke there is usually fire, and, with another Member of Congress, who is seated on the floor of the House here today, and whose identity will be made known at the proper time, conferred with a high official of the War Department, whose name and rank must obviously be held in confidence.

I was furnished substantially the same information as was contained in an article written by William K. Hutchinson, for the International News Service, which I caused to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A-4001.

Now let us get right down to the essence of this thing. The information contained in this story has never been denied by anyone in high authority. A flat denial would be simple and easy if there is no basis for the report. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] took the floor yesterday and attempted to place me on the defensive. The usual tactics of those in this administration is to attempt to question the patriotism of anyone who criticizes or reveals any questionable activities of the New Deal politicians.

It was obvious that these two gentlemen had but little information regarding the subject. If anybody thinks that by throwing out a smoke screen or attacking me personally I can be scared, somebody had better guess again. As I said yesterday, any time I am convinced politics are being played in connection with the war effort, jeopardizing the lives of millions of American boys, I intend to tell the Nation about it regardless of what may happen to me politically. And I permit no man to question my patriotism.

Let it be thoroughly understood, I do not want New Deal politicians running the War Department. There are too many capable men to carry on General Marshall's program if he is appointed supreme commander of the United Nations, without turning the job over to a political general, or giving control of the War Department to politicians. The Nation—the fathers and mothers, the brothers and sisters, the wives and children of the men and women in the armed services—want this war won as quickly as possible, with minimum loss of life and casualties, and any political manipulation of the conduct of the war would be a betrayal of our Nation, and might lose the war for us.

I feel that if by any word or deed I can prevent those in the cabal mentioned in the Hutchinson article from taking over the War Department and building it into a political machine, I will have rendered our armed forces and the Nation a service. Unless there are definite, complete denials that such a plot exists, I shall insist upon keeping this Congress and the people of the United States informed of any facts I can secure.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to commend two soldiers who, in my opinion, have made outstanding records in the war effort. Both of them have been stationed in my district in San Francisco and both have contributed greatly to the defense of our country. I refer to Lt. Gen. John L. De Witt and to Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath.

The House will remember after Pearl Harbor the delegations from California, Oregon, and Washington urged that the Japanese in all three States be evacuated. You will further recall that due to the resolutions passed by our group the President issued his directive whereby approximately 120,000 Japanese were evacuated from three Pacific Coast States. When that directive was issued, I think I reflect the sentiment of practically every layman in the country when I say we thought it was going to be an extremely difficult job. I want to say here and now that I was absolutely amazed and agreeably surprised that those Japanese were evacuated from the three Pacific Coast States without any untoward incident of any kind, without any confusion, and without any disturbance to our economy. Great credit is due General De Witt for the splendid way in which he handled the problem. As the Representative from the Fourth California Congressional District, I want my countrymen everywhere to know how much the people in my district appreciate General De Witt's excellent work.

During the recent recess I had the privilege of visiting the different supply depots that go to make up the San Francisco port of embarkation. With General Gilbreath I inspected the different depots and it was remarkable the way embarkation in the San Francisco port has been

carried on. I visited the docks where the ships are loaded. I went to the warehouses where the goods are accumulated and stored. I went to the yards where the automobiles, trucks, jeeps, and different motor vehicles are assembled and where they are prepared for embarkation. It was particularly impressive how smoothly and efficiently every detail was worked out. No confusion anywhere; no disorder. Everything so spick and span, shipshape. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that there are many mercantile establishments of long standing in the United States better organized and better operated than are the depots comprising San Francisco's port of embarkation.

It may interest my fellow colleagues to know that San Francisco for many months was the leading port of embarkation in the United States. With the step-up in the tempo in the Pacific war area it may easily be the most important port of embarkation in months ahead.

On yesterday my colleague from San Francisco, Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, introduced in the RECORD an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner of September 24, 1943. The article is entitled "War Efficiency at Coast Ports" and tells of the service being rendered by General Gilbreath. It appears on page A4011 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity of congratulating two great Americans, Lieutenant General De Witt and Major General Gilbreath.

PRICE CONTROL NECESSARY—ATTACKS HAVE WEAKENED LAW—LATEST PROPOSAL WILL DESTROY THE LAW AND CAUSE RUINOUS INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is one of the ablest men in this House. He is a very sincere Member and he is a very effective Member. He made a statement awhile ago that I do not think should go unchallenged. I inferred from his statement that the House must have been fooled or misled—I hope he did not mean it that way—in the passage of the Price Control Act in that a provision was written into the law that the Federal courts in the country could not have anything to do with restraining its operation and enforcement.

As a member of the committee that assisted in the writing of that bill may I say that it was well known why that provision was put in there. There was no secret about it. Everyone knew it. The provision was put in there for a good purpose, a purpose without which the price-control law would not be worth anything at all. If you were to pass a Price Control Act, and then allow any Federal judge in the United States to restrain price control, you would always have an injunction against price control. You would not have price control

at all. You know, we have Federal judges of different faiths and beliefs and they have their hates and their prejudices. If we permitted any Federal judge to grant an injunction against price control you would always have an injunction against price control. So you would have no price control at all.

The answer is, If you really believe in price control you should have a law that is very drastic, something that we would not stand for in peace at all. I would not stand for this law in time of peace willingly and you would not either. It was a question of adopting drastic, radical, and an arbitrary means of preventing ruinous inflation in this country, that is all. So if you want to destroy price control and not have any price control at all, the best step that you can possibly take is to sign Mr. DIRKSEN's petition and bring out the bill, then pass it and allow any Federal judge in this Nation to restrain the operation of that law. In that event you will have no law at all.

So if you believe in a ruinous, runaway inflation, let the prices go to the sky, and have no control over them, that kind of a law is the kind of law you should pass.

The last Congress was an inflationary Congress. We not only crippled O. P. A. by reducing the appropriations to where they could not do an effective job but we also reduced and eliminated an appropriation for O. W. I., the only agency that was selling the people of this country on the reason why inflation should be prevented. Yet, we come here with this body blow. Why, it is equal to the repeal of the O. P. A. law. If you are going to pass a bill like that, you might just as well face the issues squarely and say, "I do not believe in price control or rent control, I want to repeal the law absolutely." I do not think the people of this country are ready for that.

I know the O. P. A. has done some awfully foolish things, a lot of things I do not approve of at all, and things that I condemn; but at the same time the over-all picture is that we must have price control and rent control or we shall wipe out entirely and destroy the middle class of the people in this country who are dependent upon wages and salaries and fixed incomes for support.

In some places in the world today they are paying a dollar and a quarter for a loaf of bread. In Russia and China they are paying \$400 and \$500 for a suit of clothes, just a common ordinary suit of clothes such as we are wearing now. They are paying \$7.50 for half a pint of milk. That is happening over there now. It can happen here. Do you want it to happen here? Do you want ruinous inflation? Do you want to pay a wheelbarrow load of printing press money for a loaf of bread? If you do, repeal the O. P. A. law. If you repeal the price control and rent control, you will have that type of ruinous inflation.

Regardless of the mistakes that have been made price control generally has been worth a lot to this country. It has absolutely saved the country. Did you know that the basic materials that go to

make up this big war machine of ours, copper, brass, steel, and other metals, have not increased in price 1 penny in 3 years? Why? Because the O. P. A. has held down the price, that is why.

Did you know that we have been saved tens of billions of dollars in the cost of the war because the prices of the things we are having to buy in this war have been fixed, and it was impossible for them to be raised? Certainly that is true.

I could name a lot of things whose prices have not increased one penny, by reason of O. P. A. So all in all, regardless of the irritations and the annoyance that we have had in connection with it, it is a thousand times better than having runaway or ruinous inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say I am quite astonished by the gentleman's argument.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is no more astonished than I am astonished by the gentleman, because he has always been against inflation, I thought.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the gentleman's argument amounts to is that he does not want the people to have access to the regular Federal courts for redress of their grievances. That is the whole argument.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows that if you allowed any court in this Nation to restrain the operation of this law you would not have any law, because we have judges who have their hates and dislikes and prejudices just as do Members of Congress. It would be just like leaving it to any one Member of this House, and the gentleman knows what that would amount to.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. In spite of the mistakes that have been made, does not the gentleman believe that the picture in the control of inflation is much better than it was in the last war?

Mr. PATMAN. It is a lot better.

Although the regular Federal courts do not have the jurisdiction the gentleman from Illinois wants them to have those who are charged with violating the O. P. A. Act are protected in their rights by a court set up for that purpose and appeals allowed even to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 203, subsections (c) and (d) of the Price-Control Act setting up the court to deal with O. P. A. cases provides:

(c) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States

from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act; except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order or interlocutory decree staying or restraining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 2 or any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court may fix and establish a table of costs and fees to be approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the costs and fees so fixed shall not exceed with respect to any item the costs and fees charged in the Supreme Court of the United States. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

(d) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ or certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 2, of any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, and of any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or making effective any such price schedule, or any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Commissioner

Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A bill to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A bill to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

763. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting adjusted schedules regarding number of deferred employees credited to several agencies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

764. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the

Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

765. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$11,306,200 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

766. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$4,189,000 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

767. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$135,000 (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

768. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, fiscal year 1943, \$40,000, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, United States Senate and House of Representatives, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$19,359, in all, \$59,359 (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3343. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to liberalize family allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3344. A bill to extend the time for securing allowance of credit against Federal unemployment taxes for the calendar years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3345. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3346. A bill to authorize the leasing of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3347. A bill to authorize the execution of leases in behalf of Indians serving in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3348. A bill to enable soldiers to vote by proxy; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3349. A bill relating to the taxation of the grantor of certain discretionary trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FURLONG:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Res. 307. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to study and investigate matters related to air commerce and air navigation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 308. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 307; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 3350. A bill for the relief of Miss Olga Wahlstrom; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3351. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 3352. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr., Edward Gray, Jr., Bertha Mae Gray, Bertha Patom, and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 3353. A bill for the relief of Frank D. Howells, treasurer of the city of Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Mabel R. Woodfall; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2564. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition containing the names of 142 residents of Niagara County, N. Y., favoring the favorable consideration of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2565. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Elsie Wheeler and 180 citizens of Waverly, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2566. Also, petition of 59 citizens of Reisterstown, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2567. Also, petition of Rev. Earl G. Lee and 28 members of the Church of the Nazarene, Kingston, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2568. Also, petition of 29 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the

United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2569. Also, petition of Mrs. W. I. Randle and 25 citizens of Cockeysville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2570. Also, petition of the Westminster Mexican Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westminster, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2571. Also, petition of Rev. Robert B. Hamilton and 70 citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2572. Also, petition of George W. Stith and 120 citizens of Atterberry, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2573. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles W. Parsons and 50 citizens of White Plains, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2574. Also, petition of Mrs. Clara M. Evans and 57 citizens of West Milton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2575. Also, petition of 60 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wilkinsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2576. Also, petition of K. H. Ladman and 169 citizens of Esther, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2577. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Dixon, of Winfield, Mo., and 19 citizens of Lincoln County, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufac-

ture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2578. Also, petition of Mrs. C. D. Howard and 19 citizens of Winfield, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2579. Also, petition of Mrs. A. C. Walters and 25 citizens of Troy, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2580. Also, petition of Mrs. John Boborosky and 25 citizens of Pacific, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2581. Also, petition of Gertrude Sawtelle and 21 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging passage of House Resolution No. 117, to aid the starving children of occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2582. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Mrs. R. M. Reynolds and 18 other citizens of Richwood, W. Va., requesting enactment of House Resolution 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by stopping the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2583. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. W. Walter Wilson, of Traer, and other residents of Tama County, Iowa, supporting House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2584. Also, petition of Chloe Y. Frisbie, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and other residents of Eldora, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2585. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Racine Association of Commerce, Racine, Wis., with reference to House bill 3183; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2586. By Mr. BURGIN: Petition of the Forester Beverage Co., signed by a number of citizens of Wilkes County, N. C., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2587. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of Alice J. Burnside and other citizens of Oelwein, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2082 in order to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of materials necessary for winning the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2588. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of Rainbow Lodge, of Greenville, N. Y., protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2589. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Hasley and others of Little Rock, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 2082, by Mr. ERYSON, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed the production of

materials necessary for wining the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2590. By Mr. COCHRAN (on behalf of himself and his colleagues from Missouri, Mr. FLOESER and Mr. MILLER): Petitions signed by sundry citizens of St. Louis and addressed to the Congress of the United States, containing 54,607 names, urging a reduction in the cost of living, and asking for a roll-back of prices to September 15, 1942, as outlined in the following measures: (1) Subsidies on a differential basis to cover the special burdens of small business and high-cost producers; (2) grade labeling; (3) dollars-and-cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items at their September 15, 1942, level; (4) continued rent control; (5) a strong Office of Price Administration—staffed with loyal supporters of price control—given adequate funds for enforcement—with full power to enforce ceilings and to compel delivery of supplies by the food processors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful Father, whose faithfulness is constant with all our fickleness, whose forgiveness outlasts all our transgressions against Thy holy love, we bemoan the delusions which have led us to mistake shadows for substance; we confess that by the opiate of our own achieving we were lulled into cushioned optimism. Now with jarred and jolted minds we see the whole circle of the world grown somber and terrible with the fires of battle and the smoke of a judgment which envelopes us all. We behold in the torture and rubble and dust of this conflict Thy righteous sentence on our godless lives. We but reap the ghastly and costly harvest of our careless years.

Help us in this hour which reveals our desperate state, with contrition for past mistakes, with their tragic consequences; renouncing all cynicism, all disbelief in the innate splendor of humanity, that we may be empowered to fill with satisfaction to ourselves and benefit to the world the solemn role to which we have been deputized by destiny. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, September 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdoch	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE] is necessarily absent as a member of a special committee of the Senate investigating matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LUTHER M. SWYGERT TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. McCARRAN. M. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing of the committee will be held on the morning of October 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Luther M. Swygert, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations to the committee.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on September 28, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 135. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the General State Authority of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

S. 159. An act for the relief of the United States Parcel Post Building Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training Schools for Girls; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 28, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 462. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 626. An act for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Lassiter;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Robert Kish Lee and Elizabeth Kish; and

S. 1224. An act to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications.

AUDIT OF TRANSACTIONS OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of an audit made by the General Accounting Office of financial transactions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the period from July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940, which with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2649. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn., approved April 20, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 419).